



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

III.—ESTABLISHMENT AND EXTENSION OF THE LAW OF THURNEYSEN AND HAVET.

I.

§1. *Introduction.*

The Law of Thurneysen and Havet, that Prim. Lat. *ōv-* (preserving Idg. *ō*) became *āv-*,¹ is one which has not met with the entire approval of all philologists, hence it will be of service to the cause of Italic philology to bring together all the evidence, and examine it in detail. In the present essay I hope not merely to establish this Law, but also to extend it. Just as Pr. Lat. *ōv-* (preserving Idg. *ō*) became *āv-*, so too it seems that Pr. Lat. *ōv-* (preserving Idg. *ō*) became *āv-*, and in the same way also the Pr. Lat. diphthong *ou-* (preserving Idg. *ō*) became the diphthong *au* on its way to the later *ū* : *ō*.

§2. *The Literature of the subject, together with a discussion of von Planta's arguments for regarding the Law as Prim. Italic.*

The literature concerning this Latin² phonetic change up to the present time is as follows: *G. Löwe*, *Prodromus Corporis Glossariorum Latinorum* (1876), p. 348; *F. de Saussure*, *Syst.*

¹ It must be carefully observed that this Law deals only with Pr. Lat. *ōv-*, preserving Idg. *ō*, and does not affect Lat. *ōv-*, from earlier Lat. *ōv-*, preserving Idg. *ē* [cf. Brugmann, *Gr. I.*, §65, p. 52 (Engl. ed.), and especially Lindsay, *The Latin Language*, ch. IV, §19].

² Von Planta, *Gramm. der Osk.-Umbr. Spr.*, p. 115, has endeavoured to prove that this law is not confined to Latin, but is to be considered Prim. Italic, thinking that he sees traces of it in Umbrian and Oscan. That the Law under consideration should have operated in Italic, as well as in Latin, would in no way surprise us, but *for the present*, pending further evidence from these dialects than is yet available, I prefer to regard the change in question as confined to Latin, for the following reasons:

(1) In the Umbro-Samn. dialects Idg. *ō* seems, on the whole, to have had a closer pronunciation than in Latin (cf. Brugmann, *Gr. I.*, §§81, 89; see also von Planta, *ib.*, §§42-44, pp. 108-115, and §46, p. 116), and hence would have been less likely in these dialects to undergo a change to *ā* before *u*, as the change in this combination was due to a very open pronunciation of the *ō*.

Prim. des Voyelles (1879), pp. 104 sqq.; *R. Thurneysen* in Kuhn's Zeitschrift, XXVIII (1887), pp. 154-62 (dated November and December, 1884); *L. Havet* in Mém. de la Soc. de Lingu., vol. VI, Part I (1885), pp. 17-21; *K. Brugmann*, Grundr. I (1886), §81; *J.*

(2) Not a single certain instance of *ōv-* (preserving Idg. *ō*) changed to *āv-* can be produced from Oscan or Umbrian, as von Planta himself (l. c.) admits.

(3) Umbr.-Osc. *bōv-* is not so well referred to Idg. **ǵm-* as to Idg. **ǵm-* (v. infra, p. 459 and p. 460, note 1), so that if our Law were to be extended to Italic, we should expect Umbr.-Osc. **bāv-* from earlier *bōv-* (preserving Idg. *ō*). Lat. *bōs*, (gen.) *bōvis*, is certainly not a genuine Latin word (v. infra, pp. 458 sqq.), and is indeed most probably due to the influence of Samnitic Oscan (v. infra, pp. 459, 460).

(4) Lat. *ōvis* 'sheep' from Idg. **ǵm-* (: Gk. **ōfi-*, Goth. *avi-*) 'sheep,' beside Umbr.-Osc.-Pelign. **ōvi-*, is best explained as due to the influence of these other Italic dialects (v. infra, p. 461 sqq.), aided possibly by the influence of Rustic Latin (v. infra, p. 462, note 4). If we regard our Law as not confined to Latin, but common to the other Italic dialects as well, then, unless we allow that Rustic Latin (in this case the only Italic source left to which Lat. *ōvis* may be ascribed) alone resisted a Law to which all the neighbouring dialects were bowing, we must refer Italic, i. e. (so far as our records enable us to see) Lat.-Umbr.-Osc.-Pelign., *ōvi-* 'sheep,' as also Umbr.-Osc. **bōv-* [No. (3) supra], to a Greek origin, and that of no very early date; for had they been borrowed very early, we might have expected them to have become sufficiently 'naturalised' to undergo the change which befell genuine Pr. Lat. *ōv-* (preserving Idg. *ō*), a change which did not commence in Latin till the third century B. C. at the earliest (v. infra, pp. 456, 457). [Compare the fate of Greek *ἐλαι(φ)ᾱ*, which, adopted by the Romans in the period of the Tarquins (Pliny, Nat. Hist. XV 1), became subject to the Latin change of *ē* to *ō* before *l*, whence **ōlaiva*, which became **ōleiva* and finally *ōliva* (Lindsay, The Lat. Lang., ch. IV, §10, p. 228).] It seems, however, unlikely that Umbrian or Pelignian should have had much to do with Greek, hence it is better to regard at least the Umbr.-Pelign., and therefore most probably also the Oscan, *ōvi-* as genuine Italic representatives of Idg. **ǵm-*, and Lat. *ōvis* as due to their influence. I would hardly accept von Planta's suggested Idg. **ǵm-* as the original form whence Lat.-Umbr.-Osc.-Pelign. *ōvi-* are all to be derived, nor do I put faith in his alternative suggestion that, supposing Idg. **ǵm-s* to be the original form, the preservation of the *ǵm-* may be due to those forms in which *ǵ* followed (cf. Skr. *avyā avyāi*); v. infra, p. 462, note 2.

(5) Umbr.-Marruc. *avi-* 'bird' can quite easily be explained as from Idg. **ǵm-* [(Gk. **ōfi-*) v. infra, pp. 454, 455], whereas Lat. *ōvom* and Vulg. Lat. **ōvom* 'egg' (on which v. infra, pp. 455, 456) prove clearly that Lat. *ōvis* 'bird' must come from earlier Latin **ōvis* from Idg. **ǵm-s* (: Gk. **ōfi-*) 'bird.'

(6) In every instance cited, where a consonant standing between the *ō* and *v* is said not to have hindered the influence of the *v*, the 'dazwischenstehende Consonant' is a liquid, namely *l*, and it seems more probable that the *al-* of *alv-* in these instances is merely the Latin and Italic representation of Idg. **ǵ* (v. infra, §5).

E. King and C. Cookson, Sounds and Inflexions in Greek and Latin (1888), ch. V, pp. 85-9, ch. IX, pp. 187-9; *H. Schweizer-Sidler*, Gramm. der Lat. Spr., Part I² (1888), §11, 7); *F. Stolz*, Lat. Gr.² (1890), §10, p. 258, §15, Rem., p. 264; *H. D. Darbishire* in The Classical Review, vol. IV, p. 273 *b* (June, 1890), and in The Transactions of the Cambridge Philolog. Soc., vol. III, Part IV (1892), p. 189; *R. von Planta*, Gramm. der Osk.-Umbr. Dial., vol. I (1892), §§45, 50, 79 (and cf. §96); *R. S. Conway* in Idg. Forsch., vol. IV (1894), pp. 216, 217 (dated Oct. 1893); *F. Stolz* in the Historische Gramm. der Lat. Spr., vol. I, Part I (1894), §§101 *d*), 105 *c*), 148 *f*); *W. M. Lindsay*, The Latin Language (1894), ch. IV, §§17, 19, 41; and *P. Giles*, Short Manual of Comparative Philology (1895), §180, p. 141.

§3. *Examples of the change of Pr. Lat. ðv- (preserving Idg. ð) to äv-; the date of this change; and an exact statement of the Law for this change.*

It will be well for the purposes of the present essay to quote and examine all the examples cited of this Latin change of *ðv-*

(7) The word-group *vācāre*, etc., in Latin, *vakaze*, etc., in Umbrian, the only instance cited from the Italic dialects of the change of *ð* (preserving Idg. *ð*) to *ä* after *v* (that is, *u*), probably does not come from earlier *vðc-* at all, but shews original *ä* (v. infra, §6), and even if this were not so, even if this word-group were to come from an earlier *vðc-*, preserving Idg. *ð*, this could hardly be of much use to prove that Italic *ðv-* (preserving Idg. *ð*) became *äv-* in the Italic dialects.

(8) The explanation of Lat. *octāvus*, Osc. *Úhtavis* is at present a matter of so much doubt that it is hardly safe to base any conclusions on this form (v. infra, §7). Nor does von Planta's suggested derivation of Umbr. *klavlaf* *klavles*, Lat. *clāva clāvola* seem at all acceptable (v. infra, §7).

(9) Oscan and Umbrian shew no trace of the change of Prim. Ital. tautosyllabic *ðu* (from Idg. tautosyllabic *ðu*) to tautosyllabic *au* (v. Brugmann, Gr. I, §81), such as I hope to establish for Latin (v. infra, §8). As it is more than probable that the change of the Prim. Lat. diphthong *ou* (from Idg. tautosyllabic *ðu*) to the diphthong *au* was contemporaneous with the change of Pr. Lat. *ðv-* (preserving Idg. *ð*) to *äv-*, and as both are obviously due to the same cause, viz. very open pronunciation of the *o*, the fact that Oscan and Umbrian shew no traces of the former is evidence also against the occurrence of the latter in these dialects.

In conclusion it must be pointed out that even if fresh evidence were to establish the Law for Italic (as well as for Latin), nevertheless even so the change cannot be regarded as Prim. Italic (as von Planta suggests), but can only have arisen later in the different individual developements of Italic, for, as will be seen below (pp. 456 sqq., and §8 ad fin. and §9), the Law did not begin to operate in Latin itself till the third century B. C. at the earliest.

(preserving Idg. *ǵ*) to *ǣv*,¹ which, as Stolz rightly says in the *Hist. Gramm. der Lat. Spr.*, vol. I, part I, §101 *d*), manifestly must have taken place in consequence of very open pronunciation of the *o* in this combination:—

cǣvos from Prim. Latin *cōvos* [which has been proved also for Vulgar Latin at 201 B. C., v. *infra*, p. 457, and is preserved to us also in the country term *cōvum*, *cōum* or *cōhum*,² n. 'the hollow in the plough' (wrongly explained in *Paul. ex Fest.*, p. 39, 4 'lorum, quo temo buris cum iugo colligatur, a cohibendo dictum'), a 'vestigium ruris' adopted by Ennius³ with the meaning 'the hollow

¹ I would at the outset expressly state that, in endeavouring to establish the truth of the 'Law of Thurneysen and Havet,' viz. that Prim. Lat. *ǵv* (preserving Idg. *ǵ*) became Lat. *ǣv*, I do not imply disagreement from the excellent exposition of the Laws of Ablaut, so ably drawn up by Bartholomae with the aid of the fresh evidence which he has adduced from Armenian (v. Bartholomae in *Bezz. Beitr.*, vol. XVII, pp. 91 sqq.). That *ǵ* appears beside *ǣ* in the strong grade (Hochstufen) of the *ǣ*- (= Bartholomae's *a**) series is, I think, beyond all doubt, e. g. Gk. *δγ-μος* : Gk. *ἄγ-ω* Lat. *ǣg-o*, Lat. *ǵeris* : Gk. *ἄκρος*, Gk. *κόσμος* : Gk. *Κάστωρ*, Gk. *φοιτῶ* : Osc. *baiteis* Lat. *baetere* (the latter of which is probably borrowed from Oscan, cf. Brugmann, Gr. I, §432, Rem. 1). But it should be observed that the change which I am discussing does not in the least affect our views on this Ablaut-scale of Bartholomae; for the change of Prim. Lat. *ǵv*- (preserving Idg. *ǵ*) to Lat. *ǣv*- is, so to speak, quite a 'private' Latin change, and one, moreover, which, as we shall see later, did not begin to operate in Latin before the third century B. C. at the earliest, and, even if common to the other Italic dialects, at any rate could not have been so early as Prim. Ital. (v. *supra*, p. 444, note 2 ad fin.). Some scholars may perhaps consider that one or two of the instances which I cite here as examples of Latin *ǣv*- from Prim. Lat. *ǵv*- (preserving Idg. *ǵ*) should more correctly be referred to Idg. *ǣǵ*, shewing the strong grade *ǣ* of the *ǣ*- (= Bartholomae's *a**) series. Thus, e. g., they may possibly consider that Lat. *lǣvēre* (3d conjugation) : Gk. **λοfew* (whence *λοέω*) = Gk. *ἄγ-ω* Lat. *ǣg-o* : Gk. *δγ-μος* = Gk. *Κάστωρ* : Gk. *κόσμος*, etc., and thus shews Idg. *ǣ*; but, on the other hand, if we compare Lat. *lǣvēre* with Gk. **λοFe* (whence *λόε*), imperf. of Gk. **λόfew* (whence *λόω*), we must regard the *ǣ* of *lǣvēre* as from Idg. *ǵ*, which seems to me the better explanation of the two (v. *infra*, p. 451). In most of the other instances cited the evidence is very strongly in favour of my view [e. g. the formation of *fǣvēō* (*infra*, p. 451) and *ǣvēō* (*infra*, p. 451) certainly points to **fǵvēō* **ǵvēō* (preserving Idg. *ǵ*), rather than to *fǣvēō* *ǣvēō* (preserving Idg. *ǣ*), as the early Lat. form; cf. *mǣnēō*, *mordeō*, *torreō*, *dǣcēō*, *nǣcēō*, and v. Brugmann, Gr. II (= Eng. ed., vol. IV), §§790, 794], in some the evidence for an earlier Lat. *ǵv*- (preserving Idg. *ǵ*) seems incontestable (e. g. *cǣvos* from earlier **cǵvos*, v. *supra* in the text).

² For the *h* of *cōhum* cf. *Bōhilla* (a form preserved in Non. c. 2, n. 410) beside *Bōvillae*; v. Forcellini (London ed. 1828, and that of De-Vit, 1859-67). On *Bōvillae* itself v. *infra*, pp. 458 sqq.

³ 'Vix solidum complere cohū terroribū coeli,' Q. Enni Carm. Rel., *Annales* 574 Müll.

or innermost part of the heavenly sphere' (cf. Verg. Aen. IV 451 '*coeli convexa*'), whence (according to Diomedes, in Keil's Grammat. Lat., vol. I, p. 365, l. 17) Verrius Flaccus the Grammarian derived *incōhō*, spelling it thus instead of *inchōō*: Gk. *κόοι* from **κοφοι* 'cavities,' *κοῖλος* from **κοφίλος* 'empty.' In support of this view see especially Schuchardt, Vocalism. des Vulgärlat., vol. I, p. 178; Thurneysen, ib., p. 155; King and Cookson, ib., ch. V, p. 86, ch. IX, p. 188; Schweizer-Sidler, ib., §11 (7), p. 12; Havet, ib., pp. 18, 21; Lindsay, ib., ch. IV, §19.

ῥᾱveo from earlier **ῥōveō*: Gk. *πτοέω* from **πτοfew*. So explained also by King and Cookson, ib., ch. V, p. 86; Havet, ib., p. 18; Stolz, Lat. Gramm.², §15, Rem., p. 264.

The *ῥ* : *π*- affords no difficulty, cf. Lat. *ῥīns-iō*: Gk. **πρινσ-ιω*, the earlier form of *πρίσσω* (Brugmann, Gr., vol. IV, §744). Cf. also Gk. *πόλις*: *πτόλις*, *πόλεμος*: *πτόλεμος* (on which see Giles, ib., §197, p. 154). With respect to the *ῥ* : *π*-, it is worthy of mention that *ῥᾱveō* and *πτοέω* are connected together also by de Saussure, ib., p. 108, and Osthoff in Hübschmann, Das Idg. Vocalsystem, p. 190.

cᾱveō from earlier **cōveō*: Gk. *κοέω* from **κοfew*, *Δᾱφο-κόfew* (preserved by Priscian; v. Brugmann, Gr. II, §60, p. 113, Eng. ed.), *Δᾱο-κόων*, *Δημοκόων*, *θυοο-κόος*,¹ *ἀ-κούω*. This view is supported also by Thurneysen, ib., p. 155; King and Cookson, ib., ch. V, p. 86; Havet, ib., pp. 18, 21; Schweizer-Sidler, ib., §11 (7), p. 12; Stolz, Lat. Gr.², §10, p. 258, and in the Hist. Gramm. d. Lat. Spr., §101 d), p. 114; Lindsay, ib., ch. IV, §19; Giles, ib., §180, p. 141.²

¹ On this word compare 'Further Notes on the Origin of the Gerund and Gerundive,' A. J. P. XVI, Part 2 (July, 1895), p. 218.

² In Zvetiaeff, Inscr. Ital. Inf. Dial., No. 142, occur the words *ant kaīla Ioveis*, which, as the context shews, can only mean 'before the shrine of Jupiter.' But *kaīla*, as Buck, Voc. d. Osk. Spr., p. 147, truly remarks, is a 'ganz dunkles wort.' Consequently von Planta, ib., §45, p. 115, proposes to read *ka ula* instead, adding (with a query) that this latter form may possibly be from earlier **kaṃelā*- and belong to the root *kaṃ-* in Lat. *cᾱveo*. But it does not seem that much is to be gained by the proposed new reading. We must, I think, retain the inscriptional reading *kaīla*, and explain it as best we may. If the account of epenthesis in Italic given by von Planta, ib., §86, pp. 169 sqq., under the heading 'Lautgruppe *ṃk*,' is correct, so that, e. g., Lat. (*g*)*naevos* (preserved also as proper name in the abl. *Gnaivod*) Osc. *Cnaives* come from earlier **gnā-ṃiō-s*, Lat. *scævus* (together with Gk. *σκαῖός*) from **skamṃiō-s*,

cāvilla, from earlier Lat. **cōvilla*, may be explained in either of two ways:

(1) *cāvilla* 'une plaisanterie' from earlier **cōvilla*: Gk. κόβαλος 'un mauvais plaisant,' both from Idg. **kōgʷ-* (so Havet, *ib.*, p. 21), or

(2) it may be connected with the same stem as that seen in Lat. *cāveō*, from earlier Lat. **cōveō* (: Gk. κοίω, v. *supra*), in the sense of 'to know,' so that its original meaning would be 'a bit of knowledge or wisdom,' and then 'a bit of cleverness, sharpness.' (Cf. Nettleship, *Contributions to Latin Lexicography*, 1889, pp. 408, 409.)

In either case the earlier Latin form would be **cōvilla* (preserving Idg. *ō*).

fāvissae from earlier Lat. **fōvissae*, beside the kindred *fōvea*, which itself comes from earlier Lat. **fēvea*, so that we have here the two ablaut grades *ō* : *ē*. This view is supported also by Havet, *ib.*, p. 19; King and Cookson, *ib.*, ch. IX, p. 189; Stolz, *Lat. Gr.*², p. 258, §10, and in *Hist. Gramm. d. Lat. Spr.*, vol. I, part I, p. 114, §101 *d*. We shall perhaps get at the origin of the word *fāvissae* by recalling the following remark of Festus concerning it (Paul. ex Fest. s. h. v., p. 88, 4 Müll.): 'locum sic appellabant, in quo erat aqua inclusa circa templa. Sunt autem qui putant, favissas esse in Capitolio cellis cisternisque similes, ubi reponi erant solita ea, quae in templo vetustate erant facta inutilia' (cf. also Varro apud Gell. 2, 10 and Non. cap. 2, n. 341). It is manifest that Festus, Varro and Nonius all regarded the word as originally connected in some way with 'water.' *fāvissae* were probably some kind of water-tank, artificial ditch or moat. We are thus obviously enabled to refer *fāvissae* (from earlier **fōvissae*) and *fōvea* (from earlier **fēvea*) to the Pr. Idg. √ *ǵheṽ-* 'pour' (: Gk. χέω)¹ from which comes also Lat. *fundo*

Osc. *kaīla* may possibly have arisen by epenthesis from **kaīja*, which is very close to Gk. *κῆλια* (from **kaīlja*) and *καλιός* 'a wooden dwelling, hut.' It may well be pointed out that these two Greek words also developed a meaning exactly similar to that required by Osc. *kaīla* in our inscription: *καλιά* 'a wooden shrine or niche containing the image of a god,' *Apol. Rhod.* I 170; *Anth.* P. 6, 253; *καλιός* 'a chapel,' *Dion. H.* I 67, II 57, III 70; *Plut. Num.* 8, etc.

¹ Per Persson, not so well it seems, refers *fāv-issae fōvea* (writing, however, a query after them) to √ *bhā-*, in his 'Zur Lehre v. d. Wurzelweiterung und Wurzelvariation' in *Uppsala Universitets Årsskrift* (1891), pp. 140 sq.

'I pour.'¹ The second explanation ascribed to others by Festus, but obviously not the explanation preferred by himself, seems merely to imply that these *favissae* at a later date were no longer used for water, and hence were applied to other purposes, e. g. storage of various articles, etc. [whence 'favissae, *θησαυροί*' (Gloss. Philox.) finds an easy explanation]. We see much the same transference of meaning in Lat. *lacuna*, which originally meant 'a place where

¹ In these words we have *f*, instead of the normal Lat. *h*, from Idg. *ǵh*. *f* seems to have been the usual representative of Idg. *ǵh* [and perhaps also of Idg. *ǵh*, cf. *foctis* beside Lat. *hostis* from Pr. Idg. **ǵhos-ti-s*, Brugmann, Gr. I, §§389, 422, 430] in at least one Italic dialect; and considering "the constant intercourse" (which the Sabines had) "with the Romans, whose very city they, the Sabines, had helped to found" (R. S. Conway in Idg. Forsch., vol. II, p. 160), and considering that the Sabines received the 'ius suffragii' (Vellei. I 14) as early as 267 B. C., and in view of the fact that the *l* in place of *d* in many Latin words, such as *levir*, *lacruma*, *lingua*, *Melica*, *Novensiles*, *lepesta*, *larix*, *laurus*, etc., has also been with good reason referred to Sabine influence (by Conway, l. c., pp. 157 sqq.; cf. also Lindsay, ib., ch. IV, §111, esp. pp. 286 ad fin., 287 ad init.), it seems more than possible that the *f* which appears beside or instead of Lat. *h* from Idg. *ǵh* in many words—e. g. *folus* beside Lat. *holus helus* : Av. *zairi-š* 'yellowish,' Lith. *želiu* 'I grow green,' O. Bulg. *zeliže*, n. 'greens, vegetables,' etc.; *fariolu-s* beside Lat. *hariolu-s haru-spex* : Gk. *χορδή* 'a string of gut,' Lith. *žarnà* 'gut,' etc.; *fel* : Gk. *χόλος* from *ǵhel-* (V. Henry, Préc. d. Gramm. Comp. du Grec et du Latin, §113, p. 129; Fick, Vergl. Wörterb. I⁴, pp. 55, 436); *fāvissa fōvea fundo* from *ǵghey-* (v. supra in the text); *fāvos* from *ǵghey-* (v. infra in the text); *Faunus* from *ǵghey-* (v. infra in the text, §8); *fāsēna* beside Lat. *hārēna* from earlier Lat. **hāsēna* from Idg. *ǵh* (Lindsay, ib., ch. IV, §127); *fedus* beside Lat. *haedus* : Goth. *gāits* and perhaps Lith. *žaid* 'to play' (Fick, Vergl. Wörterb. I⁴, p. 433); [cf. also *fircus* (and *Fircellius*, a citizen of Reate, mentioned by Varro, R. R., bk. III, chh. 2 and 6) beside Lat. *hircus* (? *ǵh* or *ǵh*) : Osc. 'hirpus' (*Hirpini*), v. von Planta, ib., §217, p. 443, note 1]; the last three of which, viz. *fasena fedus fircus*, have been definitely ascribed to Sabine by the grammarians (Varro, L. L. V 19; cf. also Vel. Long. in Keil's Grammatici Latini, vol. VII, p. 69, l. 8)—is really due to Sabine influence (cf. Brugmann, Gr. I, §§389, 430; V. Henry, ib., §58, p. 66; von Planta, ib., §217, pp. 442 sqq.; Lindsay, ib., ch. II, §57, ch. IV, §§121, 127; Giles, ib., §138, note 1, p. 112). At the same time it is probable that this *f* only belonged to the Sabine dialect west of the mountain-range which divides the eastern part of the Sabine territory from the western. This seems established by *hiretum* (: Osc. *heriia* d, Umbr. *heris* 'vis,' *heriest* (fut.) 'volet,' Gk. *χαίρω*, etc., from *ǵgher-*) on a Sabine inscription found near Amiternum on the east side of the mountain-range. If Umbr. *felsva* is rightly connected by Bücheler, Umbr., p. 32, with Lat. *holus*, we perhaps see herein an instance of West-Sabine influence on the neighbouring Umbrian dialect, which in all other certain instances shews *h* as the representative of Idg. *ǵh* (v. von Planta, ib., §217, p. 443).

water collects' (cf. Paul. ex Fest., p. 117 Müll.: 'Lacuna aquae collectio: a lacu derivatur'), e. g. Lucr. 6, 552, but later became used for any 'cavity' or 'hollow,' e. g. Varro, R. R. 2, 7, 3 Cum supercilia cana, et sub ea lacunae, dicunt, eum equum habere annos sedecim, and 1, 29, 3 Qua aratrum vomere lacunam facit, sulcus vocatur, and Lucr. 5, 1261; the same transference of meaning is to be found even in *lacus* itself, although, with one exception (Lucil. ap. Serv. Verg. A. 1, 726, where *lacus* = 'panel in ceiling'), only in later Latin, e. g. Colum. 1, 6, 14 lacubus distinguuntur granaria, ut separatim quaeque legumina ponantur.

fāvos 'honeycomb' from earlier Lat. **fōvos*: Gk. χοή from **χοFη* 'a pouring,' χός from **χοFος* 'a liquid measure,' -χόος from **-χοFος* (e. g. in οἶνο-χόος) 'pouring' from *√gheṽ-* 'to pour.' So also Havet, ib., p. 20.

lāvō 'wash' from earlier Lat. **lōvō*: Gk. λόε (from **λοFε*), imperfect of λόω (from **λοFω*), λούω, λούω from **λοFέω*. This view is supported also by Thurneysen, ib., p. 156; King and Cookson, ib., ch. V, p. 86; Havet, ib., p. 18; Schweizer-Sidler, ib., §11 (7), p. 12; Stolz, Lat. Gr.², §10, p. 258, and in Hist. Gramm. d. Lat. Spr., §101 d), p. 114; Lindsay, ib., ch. IV, §19; Giles, ib., §180, p. 141.¹

fāveō from earlier Lat. **fōveō*, which is

either (a) from earlier **fōveĩō* 'cause to be,' the causative of *√bheṽ-*; cf. the phrase *di faveant ut . . .* (so Thurneysen, ib., p. 154; Giles, ib., §180, p. 141; cf. also King and Cookson, ib., ch. IX, p. 188);

or (b) = 'donner de la rapidité,' being based on an adjective **fōvos* = Gk. θός from **θοFος* (so Havet, ib., p. 18; cf. also King and Cookson, ib., ch. V, p. 86), or perhaps direct from earlier **fōveĩō* (causative), which, together with Lat. **fōvos*, Gk. θός θέω (from **θέFω*), would come from Idg. *√dheṽ-* 'run' (: Skr. *dhāvati* 'runs,' cf. Fick, Vergl. Wörterb. I⁴, p. 465, s. v. *dhēvo-*).

The view here taken, that **fōveō* was the earlier form of Lat. *fāveō*, is supported (but without discussion) also by Schweizer-Sidler, ib., §11 (7), p. 12.

āveō from earlier Lat. **ōveō*, from Idg. **du-éĩō*, being a causative of the same type as Lat. *mōnēō*, Gk. φορέω. This is the view

¹ In unaccented syllables this -*āv-* became -*ū-*, e. g. *ablūō* from **dālvō* (: *lāvō* from **lōvō*) from **dālvō*, *ēlūācrus* from **ēlālvācrus* (: *lālvācrum* from **lōlvācrum*; cf. Gk. λοετρών) from **ēlōlvācrus*; v. Stolz, Lat. Gr.², §14 B, 4, p. 262, and Lindsay, ib., ch. IV, §41.

taken also by Darbishire in the Classical Review, vol. IV, p. 273 b (June, 1890). With *ävëð* from earlier **ðvëð* we may compare *fävëð* from earlier **fðvëð*, just discussed.

Fävönius from earlier **Fðvönius* 'the warming wind, the west wind' from Idg. **dhōgh^h-* from Idg. *√dhegh-* 'to burn' (whence also Lat. *fðveð* from Prim. Lat. **fðveð¹*) and

fävilla 'hot cinders, glowing ashes' from earlier **fðvilla*, a diminutive of an ancient **fðva* or **fðvos* from Idg. **dhōgh^h-o-s*: Skr. *ni-dāghā-s* 'heat, summer,' Goth. *dags*, O.H.G. *tag*, O.Icel. *dagr* 'day,' Lith. *dāga-s dagà* 'harvest' (properly 'hot time'), from Idg. Gf. **dhōgho-s*, from Idg. *√dhegh-* 'burn.'²

In support of this derivation of *Fävönius* and *fävilla* see especially Thurneysen, ib., p. 159, and Lindsay, ib., ch. IV, §§19, 144 (on *fävilla*); Havet, ib., p. 19, and King and Cookson, ib., ch. IX, p. 189 (on *Fävönius* and *fävilla*).

Fävi from earlier *Fðvi*, cf. Paul. Festi 62 Th. d. P.: '*Fovi*, qui nunc *Favi* appellantur' ('*Fovii* . . . *Fabii*,' Müller).

ävilla 'lamb,' dimin. of Latin **avis* 'sheep,' from Prim. Latin **ðvis* 'sheep' (Lat. *ðvis* 'sheep' itself being due to dialectal influence, v. infra, p. 461 sqq.) from Idg. **ðvi-s* [: Gk. *ðs* from **ðvis* 'sheep,' and Goth. *avi-* 'sheep' seen in Goth. *avistr* 'sheep-fold' (from earlier Goth. **avi-vistr*, v. Brugmann, Gr. I, §643)]. In support

¹ The Latin verb *fðveð* (from Idg. *√dhegh-* 'to burn') has been derived by Brugmann, Gr. II (Eng. ed., vol. IV), §794 (and cf. §790), from Idg. **dhōgh-éið* (or rather **dhōgh^h-éið*): Skr. *dāhaya-ti* 'lets burn,' but if this derivation were correct, we should have expected Lat. *fðveð* to become **fðveð*, hence Lat. *fðveð* is preferably to be derived (with Thurneysen, ib., p. 159; Schweizer-Sidler, ib., §13, 6), p. 15; King and Cookson, ib., ch. IX, p. 189, and Havet, ib., p. 19) from earlier Lat. **fðveð*, shewing the vocalism of *tēnēð* [beside which there was also an Idg. **tōn-éið*, from which comes Skr. *tānaya-ti*, cf. Brugmann, Gr. II (= IV), §794, p. 1150, Germ. ed.], *tēpēð*, *sēdēð*, *pēdēð*, *mēdēð*, *vērēð*, *vēgēð* (v. esp. Havet, l. c.). In the same way Lat. *mðveð* is to be derived from earlier Lat. **mðveð*: Gk. *ἀ-μεύ-σασθαι* (Schweizer-Sidler, ib., §13, 6), p. 15; Havet, ib., p. 17; King and Cookson, ib., ch. IX, p. 186, and Stolz, Lat. Gr.¹, §15, p. 264) from Idg. *√mēh-* (cf. Fick, Vergl. Wörterb. I⁴, pp. 103, 286, 511). Lastly, Lat. *vðveð*, whether derived ultimately from *√segh-* (v. Brugmann, Gr. I, §428 c), and Gr. Gr.², §35, p. 56) or from a *√hegh-* (v. Osthoff in Morph. Unters., vol. V, p. 82, note 1), must come from earlier Lat. **vðveð*, preserving the *ē*-grade of the original root.

² For these words cf. Brugmann, Gr. I, §376; Fick, Vergl. Wörterb. I⁴, p. 74. With **fðva* (in the text above) beside **fðv-* Havet, ib., p. 19, compares Lat. *tōgq* beside Lat. root *tēg-* (= Pr. Idg. *√tēg-*).

of this view see especially G. Löwe, *ib.*, p. 348; de Saussure, *ib.*, p. 104, and Havet, *ib.*, p. 18. On the other hand, Brugmann, in his *Grundriss*, I, §432 c), and Gr. Gr.², §35, p. 55; Schweizer-Sidler, *ib.*, §11, 1); Stolz, *Lat. Gr.*², §47, p. 290, and Giles, *ib.*, §180, p. 141 and p. 164, identify the root of *ävilla* with that seen in *Lat. agnus*, Gk. ἀμνός, viz. Idg. *ag^h-*. Lindsay, *ib.*, ch. IV, §19, holds the balance even between the two derivations (see also King and Cookson, *ib.*, chh. V, pp. 85, 86, VI, p. 141, IX, p. 187);—and also

ävëna ‘sheep-grass’ from Latin **ävis*, from earlier *Lat. *övis* ‘sheep’ from Pr. Idg. **öyi-s* ‘sheep.’ This view is supported also by King and Cookson, *ib.*, ch. V, p. 88 [at the same time (ch. VI, p. 141) these scholars think it ‘conceivable’ that the root of *ävëna* is the same as that of *agnus*; v. supra on *ävilla*].

The view here taken concerning the origin of *Lat. ävilla* and *ävëna* is further supported by our next example:

aububulcus (Löwe, *ib.*, p. 348) or *aubulcus* (according to the correction of E. Bährens in the *Jenaer Literaturzeitung*, 1877, p. 156) ‘ovium pastor,’ from earlier Latin **ävi-(bu)bulcus* from Prim. Lat. **övi-* from Idg. **öyi-* ‘sheep’ (see especially Löwe, l. c., and de Saussure, *ib.*, p. 104).

ävis ‘bird’ is at first sight difficult; it most probably comes from earlier Latin **övis* ‘bird’ from Idg. **öy-i-s* ‘bird’: Gk. **öFi-s* seen in *οἰωνός* from **öFi-ων-os*, *οἶομαι* from **öFiομαι* [= originally ‘I augur,’ cf. *Lat. autumnus* either from Pr. Lat. **ou-tumo* from Idg. tautosyllabic **öy-* (Havet, *ib.*, p. 18), or from **ävi-tumo* from **övitumo* (Lindsay, *ib.*, ch. IV, §19)], *ᾠόν* ‘egg.’ In support of this view see esp. Havet, *ib.*, p. 18; Thurneysen, *ib.*, p. 159; King and Cookson, *ib.*, ch. V, p. 85; Darbishire in the *Transactions of the Cambr. Philolog. Soc.*, vol. III, Part 4, p. 189; von Planta, *ib.*, §45, p. 115; Lindsay, *ib.*, ch. IV, §19). But at the same time King and Cookson (*ib.*, ch. IX, p. 187) have suggested that *Lat. ävis* ‘bird’ may contain the same root as Greek *ἄερος* ‘an eagle,’ which comes from earlier **älFerós* (: *älβērós* Hesych.), from still earlier **äFieros*, from Idg. **ayü-* ‘bird’ [cf. also J. Schmidt’s (to my mind) incorrect views on Gk. *οἰωνός*, discussed in the note at the foot of this page].¹ Skr. *v-i-ṣ* (the loss of

¹ Johannes Schmidt (‘Assimilationen benachbarter einander nicht berührender vocale im griechischen’ in Kuhn’s *Zeitschr.* XXXII (1891), pp. 374–6) holds that the Greek root from which *οἰωνός* is to be derived was **älF-* [the

whose root-syllable is a trace of the ablaut of the original declension, v. Brugmann, Gr. II, §93, p. 279, Eng. ed.) gives us no aid in settling the point at issue. The evidence of the non-Latin dialects of Italy might seem at first sight to favour this identification of Lat. *āvī-* with Gk. **āFī-*:—Umbrian preserves to us *aves avis aveis* 'avibus' *avefavif avīf aveīf avvei* 'aves (acc.),' and also derivatives shewing *av-* *av-*, e. g. *aviekle aviecla* 'augurali,' *aviekate* 'auspicatae,' etc., and in Marrucinian we find *aviatas* fem. nom. plur. 'aviatae auspicatae' (v. Zvetaieff, Inscr. Ital. Inf. Dial., No. 8). We thus have certainly an

same which is seen in Gk. *ἀετός* and *αἰβητός*, v. supra, and also, according to Schmidt (but wrongly, I think, v. the text above), in Lat. *āvis* 'bird', and that the *o-* of *οἰωνός* is merely the result of assimilation to the succeeding *-ω-*. But I do not think that he has at all succeeded in proving his explanation; to say nothing of Aeol. *δῶνῶν* cited by Trypho παθ. λεξ., §15; v. Ahrens, De Dial. Aeol., §18, p. 106, note 4), which Schmidt believes not to be genuine (although recognised by Fick, Vergl. Wörterb. I⁴, p. 358), Gk. *ὄτω ὀίω ὀτομαι* are against his theory. V. Hintner, in his excellent discussion of '*ὄτω οἰομαι*' in Kuhn's Zeitschr. XXVII (1883), pp. 607-9, has conclusively proved the connexion of these two forms with Gk. *οἰωνός* (cf. also Prellwitz, Etym. Wörterb. der Griech. Spr., 1892, s. v. *οἰωνός*), and has, rightly I think, set up **ōFī-* 'bird' as the Prim. Gk. form on which *ὄτω οἰομαι οἰωνός* (cf. *autumo* above and *auguror*) were based. Schmidt, ib., p. 374, seems to object to this explanation of *ὄτω*, and yet on p. 375 he admits that *ὄτω* points to a Prim. Gk. **ōFī-*, and finally on the same page, ad fin., actually derives it from **ōFīτω* (beside Homeric *ὠίσθην ὠισθείς ἀνώστον ἀνώστι*); cf. also Hoffmann, Die Griech. Dial., vol. II, p. 453: "*οἰομαι* beruht wahrscheinlich auf **ōFīομαι*." Now, the initial *o* of Gk. *ὄτω ὀίω ὀτομαι* and (if we may include it) *οἰωνός* could not, on Schmidt's own shewing, be explained as the result of assimilation of *a* to a following *o*-sound [for he shews on p. 374 that **āFīωνος* with vocalic *ι* could not have been assimilated to **ōFīωνος*, "da das zwischen *a* und *ω* liegende vocalische *ι* der umfärbung nach *o* hin unfähig war, also der rückwirkenden kraft des *ω* eine endgiltige schranke setzte," and the same applies to *ὄτω ὀίω ὀτομαι* (*οἰωνός*)], and hence they most distinctly point to a Prim. Greek **ōFī-*; nor must we, with Schmidt, leave them "aus dem spiele" when we are considering *οἰωνός*. Furthermore, Schmidt has taken no account of the connected Gk. *ὄνν*, Lat. *ovom*, Vulg. Lat. **ōvom* 'egg,' which also seem to me to point certainly to Idg. **ōmī-* 'bird' (v. the text supra, and v. infra, pp. 463 sqq.). Thus the conclusion arrived at in the text seems correct, viz. that there were two Idg. words for 'bird': (1) **ōmī-*, (2) **āmī-*; and from the former of these two Gk. *οἰωνός* (from earlier **ōFīωνος*) comes without the least difficulty, so that there is not the least need to assume with Schmidt that **ōFīωνος* has arisen from earlier **āFīωνος* (from Idg. **amī-*) through assimilation of *a* to the following *ω*. [It may be mentioned that Fick also (Vergl. Wörterb. I⁴, p. 358) separates *οἰωνός* entirely from **āFī-*, writing "*οἰωνός* gehört zu *οἶος* (?) oder zu *οἶω* (*οἰωνός*)."]

Umbro-Marrucinian **avi-*, which (if our Law is confined to Latin, a question which has been discussed above, p. 444, note 2) can only come from Idg. **auī-* (: Gk. **āFī-*). The evidence of the Italic dialects might therefore seem at first sight to favour the view that Latin *āvis* 'bird' is also from Idg. **āuī-*. It is equally possible, however, that just as on Greek soil we find **ōFī-* (from Idg. **ōuī-*) and **āFī-* (from Idg. **āuī-*) side by side (v. supra), so too on Italic soil we find Idg. **ōuī-* (whence Prim. Lat. **ōvī-s*, whence later *āvis*) and Idg. **īuī-* (whence Umbro-Marruc. *avi-*) side by side, so that the general result of this inquiry, up to this point in the argument, seems to be the establishment of two separate Idg. words for 'bird': (1) **ōuī-s*, whence Gk. **ōFī-*, (2) **āuī-s*, whence Gk. **āFī-* and Prim. Umbro-Marruc. **avi-*, while Latin *āvis*, considered by itself alone, might come equally well from either (1) or (2).¹ But in settling the derivation of Lat. *āvis* 'bird,' it seems that we must also take into consideration, as intimately connected herewith, the Latin word for 'egg.' We must therefore anticipate for the moment

¹ If we were to have to deal only with Prim. Gk. **ōFī-ς* and **āFī-ς* beside Skr. *vi-ṣ*, we might feel tempted to regard the *o-* : *a-* of the Greek forms as prothetic [cf. Hom. ἔ(F)ῆρση, Cret. ἀερσα 'dew' beside ἔρση ἔρση, Skr. *varṣā-s* 'rain'; ὁμίχλη 'fog,' ὁμίχλω 'I make water,' inf. aor. ἀμιζαι (Hesych.): Lith. *miglà* 'fog,' Lat. *mingō*], but such an explanation could hardly hold for the Italic forms (pace Fick, Vergl. Wörterb. I⁴, p. 358, who apparently would explain the *a-* of Lat. *āvis* in this way). The more probable solution is that Idg. **ōuī-s* and Idg. **āuī-s* shew the two strong grades of ablaut (cf. Gk. *δγ-μος* : Lat. *ag-men*, ἄg-o, Gk. ἄγ-ω) from an Idg. **āu-* 'to breathe' or 'blow,' which, when extended, appears as (1) **u-ē-*, seen in Skr. *vā-ti*, Gk. ἄη-σι, Lat. *ventu-s* and Goth. *vind-s* (from **uē-nt-o-*) 'wind,' and (2) **u-ō-*, seen in Gk. ἄω-το-ς 'flock of wool, down, something which is blown about or blows about' [cf. Brugmann, Gr. II (= Eng. ed. IV), §587]. In order to reach the primal meaning of Idg. **ōuī-s* : **āuī-s*, we may note especially the above-cited ἄω-το-ς, also perhaps the Homeric (Il. XXI 386 *δίχα θυμὸς ἀγτο* 'their mind waved to and fro' (i. e. was in doubt or fear), and compare the epithet *ἠνεμόεις* as applied to *λαγώς*, meaning literally 'the windy hare,' i. e. 'rapid or rushing as the wind,' 'the wind-swift hare' (in Nic. Th. 453), and also the epithet *ὕπνεμος* applied to Thymos, with the meaning 'swift as the wind' (in Anth. Plan. 54); so that the Idg. 'bird' meant 'a creature which was like the wind, as it were a wind blowing about,' or 'wind-swift.' With these two forms from the same root, shewing an identical suffix, but shewing two different grades of ablaut in the root of the word, we may compare Gk. *ἐχ-ι-ς* 'adder, viper' : Gk. *ὄφ-ι-ς* 'snake, dragon' (Brugmann, Gr. II, §93, p. 279, Eng. ed.); compare also the well-known difference of the root-vowels in Skr. *ag-nī-ṣ* m., Lat. *ig-nī-s* m., Lith. *ug-nī-s* f., O.C.Sl. *og-nī* m. 'fire' (Brugmann, Gr. II, §95).

our discussion of the latter. It will be seen that there existed two forms: Lat. *ovom* and Vulgar Latin **ovom*. Concerning these two forms two views are possible: (1) *ovom* is the genuine Latin word for 'egg,' in which case **ovom* is a Vulg. Lat. development from *ovom*; (2) **ovom* is the genuine Latin word for 'egg,' preserved for long among the lower classes, but ousted among the upper classes by the form *ovom*, which is due to Greek influence, and probably came in during the latter half of the third century B. C. Whichever view we may take concerning Lat. *ovom* and Vulgar Latin **ovom*, it would appear that the genuine Latin word for 'egg' was based on Prim. Lat. **ov-i-s* (from Idg. **u-i-s*), thus pointing conclusively to Prim. Lat. **ov-i-s* [: Gk. **of-i-*, from Idg. **u-i-s*], and not to Prim. Lat. **av-i-s* [: Gk. **af-i-*, from Idg. **a-u-i-s*], as the Prim. Lat. form of Lat. *avis* 'bird.'¹

We have now given the examples illustrating this Latin phonetic Law, that Pr. Lat. *ov-* (preserving Idg. *o*) became Lat. *av-*. The exceptions, or apparent exceptions, will be discussed later (pp. 458 sqq.). For the present we must confine ourselves to the question, Can we approximately date the operation of this Latin phonetic Law? The question is one to which a fairly accurate and definite answer can be given. An extreme date can be fixed, before which the change of Prim. Lat. *ov-* (preserving Idg. *o*) to *av-* cannot have commenced: Lat. *nudus* 'naked' from **noudo-s* from **novedo-s* from **no(g)uedo-s* (: Goth. *naqaps* 'naked,' etc.) from Idg. **no_g-*, proves that the change of Prim. Lat. *ov-* (preserving Idg. *o*) to *av-* was later than the syncope of *e* in the post-tonic syllable (v. Lindsay, *ib.*, ch. IV, §19); whatever be the *exact* date of this, it must at any rate have taken place fairly early, for

¹ I omit from this list of examples, shewing Lat. *ov-* (preserving Idg. *o*) changed to *av-*, the Lat. *gravis*. According to Havet, *ib.*, p. 18, and King and Cookson, *ib.*, ch. IX, pp. 187, 188 (cf. also Schweizer-Sidler, *ib.*, §11 (7), p. 12), Lat. *gravis* is from earlier Latin **gravis*, from Idg. **gr₂us* according to Havet, from Idg. **gr₂us* according to King and Cookson. Havet (*l. c.*) admits that this would be an example of a non-original *o* changed to *a* before *v*: "Le même changement d'*ov* en *av* se manifeste dans un mot où l'*o* est très ancien sans être pourtant de la première heure, l'adjectif *gravis*." But this derivation of *gravis* does not commend itself so well as that given by Osthoff (in *Morph. Unters.*, vol. V, p. iii), who holds that Idg. *g* and *!* are represented on Latin soil not only by *or* (*ur*), *ul* (*ol*), but also by *ră*, *lă*, so that the *-ră-* of Lat. *gravis* is the direct representative of Idg. *-g-*.

Plautus (254-184 B. C.) uses the adj. *nūdus* (e. g. Asin. i. i. 79 and Am. i. i. 147), and in Ennius (who was born 239 B. C., came to Rome 204 B. C., died 169 B. C.) we find both the adj. *nūdus* (Enn. Ann. 517 Müll.) and the verb *nūdō* (Enn. Fab. 422 Müll.). Valuable evidence is also afforded us by Vulgar and Rustic Latin; the Spanish and Portuguese words (Span. *cueva*, Port. *cova*) shew that *cōvo-*, not *cāvo-*, was still the Vulgar Latin stem of our first example (supra, p. 447) at the time when Spain was made a province, 201 B. C. (Lindsay, *ib.*, ch. IV, §19); add to this the fact that Ennius, by whom the country-term *cōvum cōum* or *cōhum* was used, did not come to Rome till 204 B. C. From the foregoing evidence it appears conclusively proved that Pr. Lat. *ōv-* (preserving Idg. *ō*) had not suffered the change to *āv-* by 204 B. C. in Rustic Latin, and by 201 B. C. in Vulgar Latin. We shall, however, be almost certainly right in assuming that the change must have been gradually taking place among the upper classes long before that date, commencing perhaps as early as the first part of the third century B. C., so that here, as is so often the case, we find the older pronunciation, abandoned by the upper classes, preserved for long among the lower classes.¹

To de Saussure belongs the credit of being the first to observe at all systematically² the Latin phonetic change which we have been discussing; his words (*ib.*, p. 104) were: "l'ο latin devant *v* a une tendance marquée vers l'*a*, spéciale à cette langue." Later scholars expressed their views as follows: Thurneysen (*ib.*, p. 154), "fast überall, wo altes *ov* erweisbar ist, erscheint lat. *av*"; Havet (*ib.*, p. 18), "Toutes les fois que *ōv* est primitive, sa représentation latine est *av*," and (*ib.*, p. 18) "*āv* (sc. latin) représente *ou* ancien aussi bien que *au*"; King and Cookson (*ib.*, ch. IX, p. 187), "Indo-European *ou* . . . regularly becomes in Latin

¹ Above in the text I have only given the evidence available for determining the date at which Pr. Lat. *ōv-* (preserving Idg. *ō*) became *āv-*. If this change was, as seems to me beyond all doubt, intimately connected with the change of the Prim. Lat. diphthong *ou* (from Idg. tautosyllabic *ōu*) to *au* (discussed below, §8), the evidence for the date of the latter may be taken into account when we are considering the date of the former: it will be found that the evidence available for the date of the latter change is sufficient to bear out and fully confirm our conclusions, given above in the text, concerning the date of the former (v. infra, §8 ad fin. and §9).

² 'Systematically,' for Löwe in his Prodr. Corp. Gloss. Lat. (1876), p. 348 (see above on *āvilla* and *aububulcus*, pp. 452, 453), had merely thrown out a passing hint on the subject.

av." We may now state the Law for this change definitely as follows:

Lat. *ov-* (preserving Idg. *ō*), whether from Idg. *ōu-* or from Idg. *ō₃h^h-* or from Idg. *ō₃^h-*, became Lat. *āv-*, at a date later than the syncope of *ē* in the post-tonic syllable, and probably not before the beginning of the third century B. C. at the earliest among the upper classes, and not till the beginning of the second century B. C. among the lower classes.

§4. *Apparent exceptions to this Law.*

Before proceeding further, it is necessary to explain the three or four apparent exceptions to this Law that Pr. Lat. *ov-* (preserving Idg. *ō*) became *āv-*.

bōves 'oxen' is, according to Havet, *ib.*, p. 17, "un mot emprunté au grec" [the explanation which he gives also (*ib.*, p. 18) of Lat. *taurus*]. That *bōs*, (gen.) *bōvis*, is a *loan-word*¹ is proved beyond question by the initial letter *b-*, which cannot be the direct *Latin* representative of Idg. *g^h* (which would have yielded **vōs*, not *bōs*, cf. Lat. *veniō* : Gk. *βαίω*, Osc.-Umbr. *ben-*, from the labialised *√gem-*, v. von Planta, *ib.*, §169, p. 335), but it seems perhaps less likely to have been borrowed from Greek than (as Brugmann, *Gr. I*, §432, Rem. 1, and II, §160, suggested; cf. also King and Cookson, *ib.*, chh. V, p. 88, IX, p. 187; Stolz, *Lat. Gr.*², §47, p. 290, Rem. 1 and note 3; Lindsay, *ib.*, ch. IV, §141) from some Italic dialect. Havet seems to think that the *-ov-* of *bōves* can only be explained by the view that Lat. *bōves* was borrowed from Greek **βοῦες* (whence later *βόες*). But if it had been borrowed from Greek, it must have been borrowed at an extremely early period, for *Bōvillae*, a name which obviously contains the same root as the Samnite city-name *Bovianum* (cf. Osc. *Búvaianúd*, Zvetaieff, *Inscrr. Ital. Inf. Dial.*, p. 97), both of which have rightly been assigned to **hov-* *boīs* by Bücheler, *Lexicon Ital.*, s. v. (cf. the explanations of the name 'Bovillae' given by the Schol. ad Pers. Sat. VI 55, and by Non., c. 2, n. 410), is known to have been a *very ancient* town; indeed it would seem that, if borrowing from Greek took place at all in *bōs bōvis*, it must be referred (unless we suppose it to have been borrowed from the Greek colonies in central Italy) to some period when Greeks and Italians were still individual

¹ For Thurneysen's attempted explanation of *bōs*, which to me seems very improbable, see below on *ovis*, p. 461.

members of one and the same community¹; in any case the date of the supposed borrowing would seem to be necessarily (on account of *Bōvillae*) so remote that the word must have become regarded as sufficiently Latin to be subject to the above-given Law, viz. that Pr. Lat. *ōv-* (preserving Idg. *ō*) became *āv-*.² That this is not the case, that *bōves* has not become **bāves*,³ that *Bōvillae* (although situated within the Latin territory) has not become **Bāvillae*, is, I think, conclusive against the theory of a Greek (at any rate of an *early* Greek) origin.⁴

We have now to consider whether it can be explained as a loan-word from some Italic dialect [for, be it remembered, the change of *ōv-* (preserving Idg. *ō*) to *āv-* is probably confined to *Latin*, and does not affect the other Italic dialects, v. *supra*, pp. 444 sqq.], and if so, from which particular dialect; and in this inquiry we cannot too strongly insist⁵ on the fact that Latin is a language in which an exceedingly large external element forms an integral part. From the very beginning of its history, Rome was made up of a multitude of *non-Latin* elements, besides its *Latin* population. Witness the legend that the Sabines helped to found Rome; witness the legend that Romulus made Rome an 'asylum' for all outsiders who cared to come; witness too the still more important legend, the Rape of the Sabine women, and the legend of the origin of the name 'Quirites.' These legends at least imply that the population of Rome comprised an immense non-Latin, especially Sabine, element; and hence we cannot be surprised to find a reflexion of this in the language of Rome and Latium.⁶

To turn, then, to the other (non-Latin) Italic dialects: the records are scarce, but we find *bue* 'bove,' *buo* 'bovum' preserved

¹ I do not hereby wish to imply that I believe in a Graeco-Italic unity, but there probably was some period when Greeks and Italians formed two individual and gradually diverging members of a West-European community.

² Cf. the fate of Gk. *ἐλαί(φ)ᾱ* when it had been borrowed by Latin (p. 444, note 2 (3), *supra*).

³ *bōves* might have kept its *ō* through the influence of the nom. singular with *ō*, but this could hardly apply to *Bōvillae*.

⁴ It is of course just conceivable that, had *bōs bōves* (pl.) been borrowed from Greek, the *ō* of *bōves* might have been maintained in Latin through the influence of the Greek colonies in central Italy, but this seems hardly likely.

⁵ Cf. Darbishire in the *Classical Review*, vol. V (1891), p. 218 b, and Giles, *Short Manual of Comparative Philology*, §63, p. 63.

⁶ Compare p. 450, note 1, *supra*, where *l* for genuine Lat. *d*, and *f* for genuine Lat. *h*, in certain Latin words is ascribed to Sabine influence.

by Umbrian, Búvaianúd (abl. sing.) 'Boviano' preserved by Samnitic Oscan.¹ Thus it seems fairly reasonable to conclude that Latin *bōves* and *Bōvillae*, and therewith of course also *bōs*, owe their existence in Latin, and their exemption from the change which befell Pr. Lat. *ōv-* (preserving Idg. *ō*) in the third century B. C., to the influence of the other Italic dialects, and perhaps especially the Oscan of the Samnites (cf. Samn. Búvaianúd² above), with whom Rome came into very close contact at an early date.³

There is nothing unreasonable in the supposition that the word for 'bull' should have been borrowed by the warlike Romans from their more pastoral neighbours, among whom the Samnites, despite their capacity for war evinced later, must be included; there are, moreover, other means of shewing that the 'bull' was almost a household word in Italy, and hence the dialectal word for 'bull' might well have made its way into the language of Latium. I refer to the numerous instances of bulls on extant coins of all parts of Italy except Rome.⁴ I quote the following from Sambon's *Recherches* (1870): (a) bull, with a bearded man's face, with or without other accessories: *Marrucini*, *Teate*

¹ This Umbr.-Samn. **bōv-* might, from a phonetic point of view, come equally correctly from Idg. **s̥ōu-* (provided that our Law is confined to Latin, and is not to be extended to Italic) or Idg. **s̥ōu-* (v. Brugmann, Gr. II, §160, and von Planta, ib., §45, p. 116). The *-ōv-* of Lat. *(b)ōv-* could of course come quite regularly from Idg. **(s̥)ōu-*; so that, if we might set up Idg. **(s̥)ōu-* as the original form of Umbr.-Samn. **bōv-* and Lat. *(b)ōv-*, all our difficulty would at once vanish, for such an explanation would of course exclude Lat. *(b)ōv-* from the influence of our Law, which deals only with Pr. Lat. *ōv-* preserving Idg. *ō*; but I feel bound to agree with Buck (Vocal. d. Osk. Spr., p. 165) in deriving Umbr.-Samn. **bōv-* from Idg. **s̥ōu-* rather than from Idg. **s̥ōu-*, hence neither can we derive the *-ōv-* of Lat. *(b)ōv-* from Idg. **(s̥)ōu-*.

² Bovianum is only 14½ miles from the (eastern) boundary of Latium. In this connexion it will be remembered also that Bovianum was the capital of the Samnites, and was twice captured by the Romans in the course of the Samnite wars (in 305 B. C. and again in 293 B. C.).

³ League between Rome and Samnium, 354 B. C.; the three Samnite wars, 343 B. C.-290 B. C.; extension of the 'ius suffragii' to the Samnites, 268 B. C.

⁴ A bull is very rarely, if ever, to be found on coins of Rome. The bronze coins given under 'Campania' by Sambon, *Recherches* (1870), XII 44, shewing half a bull with a bearded man's face, and bearing the legend ΠΩΜΑΙΩΝ, are probably not genuine Roman coins, but coins *struck in Campania* at the time of the surrender of Capua to Rome, 343 B. C. (Sambon, ib., pp. 153, 170).

Pl. VI 7; *Samnium*, Aesernia XIII 9, Alifa¹ (= Allifae) XI 33, Fistelia¹ XI 29, 30, Larinum² XIII 10, Malies (= possibly Maloentum, v. Sambon, ib., p. 186) XIII 5; *Campania*, Cumae X 6, Hyria XI 26-28, Neapolis X 7-9, 13-16, Nola XI 23-25; *Bruttii*, Rhegium XXII 2;—(b) bull, with its own natural face, with or without other accessories: *Latium*, Lanuvium IX 10 (v. Sambon, p. 123); *Apulia*, Arpi XV 16, Grumum XV 23; *Lucania*, Posidonia XX 17, XXI 34, Sybaris XX 14, 16, Thurii XX 23, 27, 30, XXI 35, 41;—(c) bull's head with or without other accessories: *Picenum*, Firmum VII 7; *Vestini*, VI 4; *Apulia*, Rubi XV 11, Caelia XV 10. To this list of coins we may add the fact that at the outbreak of the Social War (90-89 B. C.), when Picentines, Marsians, Pelignians, Marrucinians, Vestinians, Samnites, Apulians and Lucanians leagued together against Rome, choosing Corfinium as the capital of the new federation, and naming it 'Italica,' they struck (int. al.) coins (for a specimen of which v. Sambon, ib., Pl. XIII 17 and cf. p. 190, §11) bearing a representation of the 'bull of Italy' going 'the wolf of Rome.'

ovis 'sheep' is also a borrowed word—from Greek, according to Havet, ib., pp. 18, 30; from the Italic dialects, according to King and Cookson, ib., ch. V, p. 88.³ Thurneysen, discussing Lat. *ovis vitulus bōs* in Kuhn's Zeitschr. XXX, p. 487, suggests that they "von jenen stämmen ererbt sind, die vor dem einrücken der latinischen, samnitischen, umbrischen völkerschaften im mittleren Italien ihre viehzucht betrieben, und die von jenen überwältigt wurden." This last-mentioned explanation seems to me (cf. also von Planta, ib., §45, p. 116) very unsatisfactory. Of the two former, that of King and Cookson seems far preferable; Lat. *ovis* may quite easily be explained as borrowed from the neighbouring non-Latin dialects, in which we find the following forms preserved: Umbr. *ovi* uvef 'oves,' uvem uve 'ovem,' uvikum 'apud ovem' (v. Bücheler, Umbrica, s. v. *ovi*), Pelignian and Oscan *Ov.* 'Ovius' (v. Zvetaieff, Inscr. Ital. Inf. Dial., 21, 26, 248-52), Pelignian *Oviedis* 'Oviedius' (v. Zvetaieff, ib., 27); cf.

¹ Alifa and Fistelia are included in Campania by Sambon, but Dressel, in Curtius, Hist. u. Philol. Aufs. (1884), pp. 247 sqq., has conclusively proved that they were in Samnium.

² Larinum, more strictly perhaps to be placed among the Frentani.

³ So also Darbishire (with some uncertainty) in the Transactions of the Cambr. Philolog. Soc., vol. III, Part 4 (1892), p. 189. See also Giles, Short Manual of Comparative Philology, §63, p. 63.

Bücheler, *Lex. Ital.*, s. v. '**ovi oīs*.'¹ It has been shewn above that the name for 'bull' in its various cases (Lat. *bōs bōvis*, etc.) and its derivative (*Bōvillae*) owed their existence in Latin, and their exemption from the general change which befell Pr. Lat. *ōv-* (preserving Idg. *ō*), to the influence of the other Italic dialects, hence it is not unreasonable to suppose likewise, that although the genuine early Latin form of the word 'sheep,' viz. **ōvis* from Idg. **ōwis* [: Gk. *ōis* from **ōfis* 'sheep' and Goth. *avi-* 'sheep' (v. supra, p. 452)],² became **āvīs* (whence *āvilla*, *āvēna* and *au(bu)-bultus*, on which v. supra, pp. 452, 453), the form *ōvis* was nevertheless re-introduced³ into Latin from the neighbouring non-Latin⁴ (e. g. Umbr.-Osc.-Pelign.) dialects.⁵

¹ Supposing that this explanation of the existence of the forms *bōs* and *ōvis* in Latin, as due to the influence of the other Italic dialects, is correct, we have at once an obvious and easy explanation of Lat. *iuvenus*. According to Hoffmann's Law—viz. that in an accented closed syllable Lat. *en em* (whether from Idg. *en em* or from Idg. *ṇ m*), if followed in Latin by a guttural, became *in im* (Hoffmann in Bezz. Beitr., vol. XVIII, 1892, pp. 156-9)—Lat. *iuvenus* (from Idg. **iunm-kō-s*) should have become Lat. **iuvincus*; but it has retained its *e* doubtless through the influence of the other Italic dialects, where we find Umbr. *ivengar* 'iuvencae' *ivenga* 'iuvencae' i v e k a 'iuvencam' and 'iuvencae.' It is noteworthy that all these three Latin words, *bōs* *ōvis* *iuvenus*, are animal-names.

² I would hardly accept von Planta's (ib., §45, p. 116) suggested Idg. **ēwi-* as the original form whence Lat.-Umbr.-Osc.-Pelign. *ōvi-* are all to be derived, first, because Gk. **ōfi-* 'sheep' (cf. Hoffmann, *Die Griech. Dial.*, vol. I, 1891, p. 153) and Goth. *avi-* 'sheep' are against such a view, secondly because such a derivation takes no account of Lat. *āvilla*, *āvēna* and *au(bu)bultus*; it seems to me that there is more to be said for the explanation of Lat. *āvilla* as a dimin. of Lat. **āvīs* (from earlier Lat. **ōvis* from Idg. **ōwi-s*) 'sheep' [cf. Lat. *angui-s* 'snake' (beside O.Ir. *esc-ung* 'swamp-snake,' i. e. 'eel'): Lat. *anguilla* 'eel,' Brugmann, *Gr. I*, §433 a)], and of Lat. *āvēna* *au(bu)bultus* also as derivatives of the same Lat. **āvīs* (from earlier Lat. **ōvis* from Idg. **ōwi-s*) 'sheep,' than for the view that they represent Idg. **a₃-* (v. supra, pp. 452, 453, on these forms). Nor do I put any faith in von Planta's alternative suggestion (l. c.) that, supposing Idg. **ōwi-s* to be the original form, the preservation of the *ō*-may be due to those forms where *i* followed (cf. Skr. *avyā avyāi*, etc.).

³ A somewhat similar parallel in Germanic is the following: A.S. *æg* 'egg' became (regularly) Mid.Eng. *ey* 'egg' and is now obsolete, having been replaced by *egg*, which has been introduced from Icelandic. See Skeat, *Principles of English Etymology*, first series (second edition, 1892), chh. XVIII, §339, pp. 365, 366, XXIII, §434, pp. 470, 471 (where he corrects the views which he had expressed in his Dictionary). Cf. also Skeat, ib., ch. VI, §56, p. 76.

⁴ If the suggestion made below (p. 464, note 1) should prove to be correct, viz. that our Law may possibly have never affected *Rustic Latin* at all, then

ōvom 'egg' is extremely difficult. Its existence in Latin has been held by some to condemn, or at least to weaken the case for, the above-discussed Law (that Lat. *ōv-*, preserving Idg. *ō*, became *āv-*), on the ground that Prim. Lat. **ōvīom*, which they suppose the upholders of our Law to regard as the earlier form of Lat. *ōvom*, must, if our Law is correct, have become Latin **āvīom*, which in its turn (they say) must have yielded **āvom*, not *ōvom*. They are wrong in supposing that Pr. Lat. **ōvīom*, even according to our Law, could have become **āvom*, but they are right in holding that **ōvīom* is *not* the earlier form of *ōvom*, for, in the first place, Prim. Lat. **ōvīom* (based on Prim. Lat. **ōvis* from Idg. **u̯is*) could not have become anything except (1) Lat. **ōvīum* (cf. Brugmann, Gr. I, §135), whence later by the above-given Law **āvīum*, which could not possibly be the antecedent of the postulated **āvom*, or (2) Lat. **oivom* (if the account of epenthesis in Italic given by von Planta, ib., §86, pp. 169 sqq., under the heading 'Lautgruppe *u̯i*,' is correct), whence we might have expected **āvom*, cf. Lat. *oinos* whence *oenos* whence *ūnos* (Brugmann, Gr. I, §81, p. 74, Eng. ed.). In the next place, that Lat. *ōvom* arose from Pr. Lat. **ōvīom* (based on Pr. Lat. **ōvis* 'bird') at a date before our Law began to operate, is to be denied, for Lat. *ōvom*, as already shown, cannot at any time have been the direct outcome of Prim. Lat. **ōvīom*, any more than Greek *ὄον* can be the outcome of Prim. Greek **ōF_{kon}* [which must have yielded Gk. **olF_{ov}* (parallel to the postulated Lat. **oivom* from the postulated Prim. Lat. **ōvīom* above), cf. *οἰωνός* from **ōF_iωνος*, *οἶομαι* from **ōF_iομαι*, v. supra, p. 453 and p. 453, note 1]. Hence Lat. *ōvom* cannot by any possible means be referred back to an earlier Latin form **ōvīom*, consequently this argument brought against our Law falls to the ground.

Thurneysen, ib., p. 159, and von Planta, ib., §86, p. 170, derive *ōvom* from **ōīūom*, which arose, according to these scholars, by epenthesis from **ōu̯īom* [: Skr. *āvīam*, Gk. *ᾠ(F)ιον*]; but I hesitate to accept this explanation of *ōvom*, for it seems probable that just

Pr. Lat. **ōvis* (from Idg. **ōu̯i-s*) would in *Rustic Latin* have throughout remained *ōvis*. Rustic Lat. *ōvis* might well have aided the re-introduction of the form *ōvis* into Latin itself.

⁵ The suggestion of King and Cookson, ib., ch. V, p. 88, note 1 (cf. also ch. IX, p. 187), that "*ōvis* instead of **āvīis* may possibly be due to an assimilation to *ōōvis*," does not seem very likely, but nevertheless this 'formal' resemblance may have aided the dialectal influence in preventing the re-introduced *ōvis* from again becoming **āvīis*.

as Lat. *ōv-* (preserving Idg. *ō*) became *āv-*, so also in the same way and at the same time (although no absolutely *certain* example of the change has yet been offered) Lat. *ōv-* (preserving Idg. *ō*) became *āv-* (v. infra, §7), in which case we should, I think (pace Thurneysen, l. c.), have expected Lat. *ōvom*, thus derived, to have become **āvom*.

It has been suggested that *ōvom* : *āvis* = (e. g.) Skr. *sāvitṛ-ā-s* : Skr. *sāvītār-* ('sprung from the bird' : 'bird' = 'sprung from the sun' : 'sun'), in other words, that *ōvom* is formed on *āvis* with vṛddhi of the first syllable. This view has failed to meet with the approval of Brugmann (Gr. II, §60, Rem. 1, p. 113, Eng. ed.). Prellwitz (Etym. Wörterb. d. Griech. Spr., 1892) explains Gk. *ᾠόν φόν* as from a form **ᾠῶiom*, the *ō* of which he regards as vṛddhied from **ᾠῶi-s* (seen in **ᾠῶivos*), and in the same way we might regard the *ō* of Lat. *ōvom* as vṛddhied from Prim. Lat. **ōvī-s* (the earlier form of *āvis*), so that Gk. *ᾠόν*, Lat. *ōvom* : Gk. **ᾠῶi-*, Lat. **ōvī-* = Skr. *sāvitṛ-ā-s* : Skr. *sāvītār-*. But against this view there is the objection, mentioned above, that *ōvom*, if it were rightly thus derived, would probably have become **āvom*.¹

At the same time, that Lat. *ōvom* and Lat. *āvis* are connected together seems to be beyond all reasonable doubt; but the difficulty is to shew what the exact connexion is.

So far we have dealt with *ōvom* as a genuine Latin word, and as such scholars have endeavoured to explain it (wishing naturally to trace it back, if possible, to the same original form whence Skr. *āvya-*, Gk. *ᾠ(F)ῶν* come); but there is reasonable ground for regarding such an assumption as incorrect. Italian *uovo*, Spanish *huevo*, Old French *uef* 'egg' (as Lindsay, ib., ch. II, §25, has pointed out) prove the existence of a Vulgar Latin **ōvom* 'egg' beside Latin *ōvom*; it is of course just conceivable (as indeed Mr. Lindsay suggested to me in a recent letter) that *ōvom* might have become **ōum*,² as *cōvom* became *cōum*, and that the *ō* was then shortened before the following vowel (whence **ōum*), the *v* being

¹ This objection might perhaps be overcome by a suggestion which Mr. Lindsay recently offered me—namely, that "*ōvom* may be a country-term like *ōvis* and *cō(v)um*," and that the Law under discussion may possibly have never affected *Rustic* Latin at all.

² In this connexion it may be well to quote Georges, *Lexicon d. Lat. Wortf.*, col. 484, s. v. *ovum*: "Form *oum* von Prob. inst. (IV) 113, 18 getadelt." That Probus was correcting an actually existing pronunciation of which he did not approve seems obvious from Lindsay, ib., ch. II, §53.

restored from the oblique cases (whence **ōvom*); in other words, that there was 'grammatischer Wechsel' of *ō(v)*- (nom. acc.) and *ōv*- (gen. dat., etc.); but I think there is a better explanation at hand, viz. that Vulg. Lat. **ōvom* preserves to us the genuine Latin form of the word 'egg'¹ (just as *cōvos*, the earlier form of *cāvos*, v. supra, p. 447, was long preserved in Vulg. Lat.), while *ōvom* is to be explained as due to some external influence, a question which we now proceed to discuss.

If we seek for aid in the Italic dialects, we find nothing to help us. The only two dialects which have preserved to us any form of the word for 'bird,' viz. Umbrian and Marrucian, both shew *avi*- which probably comes from Idg. **āyi*- (v. supra, p. 455); but at the same time it must not be forgotten that our records of the Italic dialects are very scarce; it is quite possible (as said above) that, just as on Greek soil we find **ōfi*- 'bird' (from Idg. **ōyi*-) and **āfi*- 'bird' (from Idg. **āyi*-) side by side, so too some of the other Italic dialects [in addition to Latin, whose *āvis* comes from earlier Lat. **ōvis* (cf. Vulg. Lat. **ōvom* 'egg,' v. supra, p. 456) from Idg. **ōyi*-s] might have preserved to us forms derived from Idg. **ōyi*- (and possibly even some form based thereon, meaning 'egg') beside the Idg. **āyi*- of Umbro-Marruc. *avi*-. In this case we might have been able to prove that Lat. *ōvom* (with *ō* unchanged to *ā*), like *bōs bōvis Bōvillae* and *ōvis* 'sheep' (v. supra), owed its existence in Latin to the influence of some neighbouring Italic dialect; but it is perhaps after all not necessary to look for evidence of the other Italic dialects, in order to explain the *ō* of Lat. *ōvom*: another explanation is at hand.

Havet, ib., p. 18, has explained *ōvom* as borrowed from Greek (a view which dates back at least as far as Forcellini, London edition, 1828): "ὄν suppose **ōiFov* pour **ōFiov* . . . Cet **ōiFov*, une fois l'ε devenu muet, a fourni aux Latins *ōvum*." It seems to me that by uniting Havet's theory with the evidence of Vulgar Latin given by Lindsay (v. supra, p. 464) we may possibly reach at last the true explanation of Latin *ōvom*.

Just as Spanish *cueva* shews that *cōvo*-, not *cāvo*-, was the Vulgar Latin stem of Latin *cōvos cōus cōhus cāvus* (v. supra, pp.

¹ With **ōvom* formed on **ōv-i*-s (whence later *āvis*), cf. Lat. *crinālis, fustū-ārium, grāvō, menstrūus, piscārius piscor piscōsus piscūlentus, sentus, testor, torquātus*, if these are formed on Lat. *crini-s, fusti-s, grāvi-s, mensi-s, pisci-s, senti-s, testi-s, torqui-s*.

447, 457) at the time when Spain was made a province, i. e. 201 B. C. (Lindsay, *ib.*, ch. IV, §19), so too Span. *huevo* proves that **ovom* was the form of the word 'egg' in use in Vulgar Latin at that date. Now, it is a well-known fact that many of the works of Livius Andronicus (fl. 240 B. C.), Naevius (274*-202* B. C.), Plautus (254*-184 B. C.), Ennius (239-169 B. C.), Pacuvius (220*-130* B. C.) and Terence (194-159 B. C.) were merely translations of or adaptations from the works of the Greek dramatists; it is also well known that in these translations and adaptations they introduced many words into Latin from Greek (cf. Saalfeld, *Tensaurus Italo-Graecus*, and Weise in *Archiv für Lat. Lexicogr.*, 1893, pp. 469 sqq.); nor should we forget in this connexion that Livius Andronicus, the first dramatist of Rome, was himself a Greek¹; and lastly be it remembered that there was close contact between Hellas proper and Rome from 230 B. C. onwards [the Illyrian wars, 230-229 B. C. and 219 B. C.; the Macedonian wars, 214-205 B. C., 200-196 B. C., 171-168 B. C.; the settlement of Greece by Flamininus, 196 B. C.; the war with Antiochus the Great (carried on partly in Greece), 192-190 B. C.]. All these facts taken into consideration, the history of the word under discussion seems to be as follows:

**ovom* [based on Prim. Lat. **ovis* (from Idg. **dʰi-s*), whence later *avis* 'bird'], the genuine Latin word for 'egg,' was used among all classes in the early part of the third century B. C. [about which time the change of Lat. *ov-* (preserving Idg. *o*) to *av-* was probably only just beginning to arise], but some time in the course of the latter half of the third century B. C. among the upper classes [and perhaps later among the lower classes as well (but at any rate not till after 100 B. C., for O.Fr. *uef* proves that **ovom* was still the Vulg. Lat. form at 100 B. C.)] **ovom* gave way to *ovom*, which, some time in the latter part of the third century B. C., was either (1) directly borrowed from the Greeks (? of Hellas proper, or possibly of the Greek colonies in Italy), or (2) introduced into Latin indirectly from Greek by means of the Roman dramatists, the first of whom was himself a Greek (*v. supra*), and so used as a loan-word for a time, until it gradually came to be regarded as a genuine Latin word, or (3) merely

¹On the general question of the enormous influence exercised over the Romans by 'Greek manners, Greek art, Greek language and literature' from an early period, see especially Max Müller, *The Science of Language* (1882), vol. I, lect. III, pp. 109 sqq.

remodelled to *ðvom* among the upper classes on analogy of the Greek word.¹ In any case, the form *ðvom* instead of earlier and genuine Latin **ðvom* seems to be due to the influence of Greek; and in this connexion we may well compare the striking parallel exhibited in English: the so-called 'English' *egg* is really not an English word at all, but is certainly a Scandinavian loan-word, from Icel. *egg* (Swed. *ägg*, Dan. *æg*), which has ousted the genuine Mid. Engl. *ey* (from Anglo-Sax. *æg*) 'egg.'²

cōvinnus 'carriage' (Mart. 12, 24, 12), more strictly 'sickle-chariot,' a war-chariot of the Britons and Belgae (cf. Pompon. Mela 3, 6, 5; Sil. Ital. 17, 416; Lucan 1, 426; also *cōvinnarius* Tac. Agric. 35 and 36), affords no difficulty, as it is certainly a Celtic loan-word (cf. Stolz in the Hist. Gramm. d. Lat. Spr., vol. I, part I, §6, p. 10).

ST. JOHN'S COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE, ENG.
1895.

LIONEL HORTON-SMITH.

¹ In discussing the date at which the change of Prim. Lat. *ðv-* (preserving Idg. *ð*) to *āv-* took place (v. supra, p. 456 sqq.), I purposely omitted from consideration the Latin word for 'egg,' as its correct explanation is so extremely doubtful. Should the explanation which I have suggested in the text turn out to be correct, viz. that **ðvom* (the form proved for Vulgar Latin by Ital. *uovo*, Span. *huevo*, Old French *uef* 'egg') may have been the genuine Latin form of the word 'egg' (the *ð* of *ðvom* being due to external influences), then it must be observed that while Span. *huevo* proves that **ðvom* was the Vulgar Latin form in 201 B. C., Old French *uef* proves that **ðvom* was still the Vulgar Latin form as late as 100 B. C. In this case it is just possible (cf. p. 464, note 1, supra) that the change of Pr. Lat. *ðv-* (preserving Idg. *ð*) to *āv-* may never have taken place at all in Vulgar and Rustic Latin (or, at any rate in the case of Vulgar Latin, only at a late date, i. e. after 100 B. C.). But it would be unsafe to venture conclusions based on the etymology of a word whose explanation is fraught with so many difficulties.

² See Skeat, Principles of English Etymology, first series (second edition, 1892), chh. XVIII, §339, pp. 365, 366, XXIII, §434, pp. 470, 471; and cf. supra, p. 462, note 3.

(To be continued.)